

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 to 3, 5 and 7 through 11 have been rejected as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,118,233 to Craig et al. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 4 and 6.

In order to more clearly define the invention, Claim 10 has been amended.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider his rejection of Claim 1. The Examiner has identified transistor Q5 in Craig et al as a pull-down transistor. The identification is inconsistent with the description of Craig et al. Column 5, lines 54 and 55, of Craig et al, specifically identify transistor Q20 as a pull-down transistor.

The Applicant submits that Craig et al does not anticipate Claim 1. Nowhere does Craig et al show or suggest:

“said capacitive load (C1, C22) being coupled to said pull-up transistor (Q1) for generating said control voltage of said pull-up transistor from a charge stored in said capacitive load”

as specifically recited in Claim 1. Rather, Craig et al shows the base, of pull-up transistor Q1, isolated from the capacitive load by diodes D4 and D5, so that current can not flow from the capacitive load to charge storage capacitor C26. It is therefore clear that Craig does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 9 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 10 as amended specifically recites:

“said storage capacitor being charged from said capacitive load”.

Nowhere does the patent to Craig et al show or suggest this structure. Rather, in Craig et al, storage capacitor C26 is charged from VSU when pull-down

Customer No. 24498  
Serial No. 10/511,838  
November 29, 2007

PATENT  
PU030039

transistor Q20 is conductive. See column 5, lines 36 to 41. It is therefore clear that the patent to Craig et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 10 as amended.

Claim 11 is dependent from Claim 10 and sets forth a further advantageous feature. The Applicant submits that Claim 11 is patentable as its parent Claim 10.

The Applicant has reviewed the two patents which have been cited by the Examiner but not relied upon. The Applicant believes that these references are no more relevant to the invention than the patent to Craig et al upon which the Examiner has relied.

The Applicant therefore submits that the instant Application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Barrett George



by Daniel E. Sragow  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 22,856  
(609) 734-32

Patent Operation  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: November 29, 2007